

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this Application. Claims 11-15 are currently withdrawn.

Claims 1-10 are currently amended. Claims 11-15 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claim amendments can be found throughout the specification and the drawings.

Claims 1-10 are now pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,895,382 (hereinafter “Srinivasan”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,119,102 (hereinafter “Rush”).

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-8 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101. For example, amended claim 1 recites “launching a workflow from a first interface associated with a computer for arriving at the make or buy decision” and “displaying information on a second interface associated with a computer, the information indicative of the make or buy decision.”

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S. C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections to claims 1-10 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Srinivasan in view of Rush. Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose one or more of the claim limitations recited in each of claims 1-10. These differences, along with other difference, establish that the subject matter as a whole of claims 1-10 would not have been obvious at the time of invention to a person of ordinary skill in the art.

For example, amended claim 1 recites “launching a workflow from a first interface associated with a computer for arriving at the make or buy decision” and “displaying information on a second interface associated with a computer, the information indicative of the make or buy decision.” However, Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the workflow as recited in amended claim 1. More specifically, that Srinivasan and Rush fail to disclose the steps of the workflow and the interaction of the workflow participants as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Srinivasan and Rush, either individually or in combination, fail to disclose each and every claim limitation as recited in amended claim 1. Applicants further respectfully submit that none of the cited references cure the above-discussed deficiencies of Srinivasan and Rush and thus, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 9 and 10 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claim 1, and others. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-8 that depend directly and/or indirectly from independent claim 1, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further respectfully submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

Unless otherwise specified, amendments to the claims are made for the purposes of clarity, and are not intended to alter the scope of the claims or limit any equivalents thereof.

While Applicants do not necessarily agree with the prior art rejections set forth in the Office Action, these amendments may be made to expedite issuance of the Application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue claims to subject matter similar to those pending before the present Amendment in co-pending or subsequent applications.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 925-472-5000.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter, Reg. No. 53,437/
Sean F. Parmenter
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 925-472-5000
Fax: 415-576-0300
SFP:lls
62072752 v1